

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Office Action, Claims 16, 30, 34, and 38 were amended. Claims 19, 20, 24-29, 31-33, 35-37, 39, and 40 remain unchanged. New claims 41-44 have been added.

Rejection of Claims 16, 19, 20, and 24-29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agarwal et al (US 6,992,995) in view of Sorenson (US2002/0061009):

Applicant respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 16, 19, 20, and 24-29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agarwal et al (US 6,992,995) in view of Sorenson (US2002/0061009) as herein amended.

Independent claim 16 has been amended to clarify Applicant's invention. Specifically, Independent claim 16 has been amended to clarify that the mobile node maintains a binding update list of one or more correspondent nodes that have received a binding update corresponding to the mobile node. Support for this amendment can be found in page 9, lines 28-30 of Applicant's original specification.

Applicant respectfully submits that Agarwal et al (US 6,992,995) in view of Sorenson (US2002/0061009) does not anticipate Applicant's invention as claimed in claim 16 as herein amended. Specifically, Agarwal et al (US 6,992,995) in view of Sorenson (US2002/0061009) does not anticipate maintaining a binding list even when a mobile is connected to a home network. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's contention in item 1, page 2, of the office action dated November 14, 2006 that it is obvious that a mobile node which is in its home network will need to actively maintain a binding list and send binding updates. Applicant respectfully submits that due to the significant overhead required on a node in terms of processing power, state and bandwidth to always keep track of every node that has previously sent a packet to the mobile node, send an update to that node and periodically refresh them, it would not be obvious to maintain such a list. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that 16 is in proper condition for allowance and request that claim 16 may now be passed to allowance.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 19, 20, and 24-29 as herein amended. Claims 19, 20, and 24-29 contain further limitations of the now believed

to be allowable amended claim 16. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 19, 20, and 24-29 are in proper condition for allowance and request that claims 19, 20, and 24-29 may now be passed to allowance.

Rejection of Claims 30-40 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agarwal et al (US 6,992,995) in view of Sorenson (US2002/0061009) and further in view of Malki (US2001/0046223):

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 30-40 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agarwal et al (US 6,992,995) in view of Sorenson (US2002/0061009) and further in view of Malki (US2001/0046223) as herein amended.

Applicant respectfully submits that Agarwal et al (US 6,992,995) in view of Sorenson (US2002/0061009) and further in view of Malki (US2001/0046223) does not anticipate Applicant's invention as claimed in claims 30-40. Specifically, Agarwal et al (US 6,992,995) in view of Sorenson (US2002/0061009) and further in view of Malki (US2001/0046223) does not anticipate having a care of address in a home network. In Agarwal et al (US 6,992,995) in view of Sorenson (US2002/0061009) and further in view of Malki (US2001/0046223), a mobile node sends a binding update with its CoA to a correspondent node and adds the CN to the binding list. By definition a CoA is a topologically correct address obtained by the mobile node in a foreign network. [See Column 3, lines 2-10 in Agarwal et al., for example] Furthermore, what would a mobile-node use as CoA when it is in its home network? That is also not obvious either. Note that the mobile node already has its home address which is topologically correct address its home subnet.

Applicant respectfully points out to the Examiner that Malki, paragraph 32 is in the context of figure 3 which clearly shows the mobile away from its home network. Furthermore in paragraph 5, when describing the context, it states that a mobile obtains a CoA when it is in a foreign network. Both the LCoA and RCoA are in the context of a foreign network. Malki does not teach the concept of a mobile node maintaining a binding update list when it is in its home network. Applicant respectfully submits that it is non-intuitive for a mobile node to keep a binding list of the nodes when it is in its home network.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 30-40 are in proper condition for allowance and request that claims 30-40 may now be passed to allowance.

New Claims

Applicants have herein added new claims 41-44. Support for claims 41-44 can be found in FIG. 8, and on page 14, line 16 through line 30 of Applicants' originally filed specification. Consequently, claims 41-44 do not introduce any new matter into the specification. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 41-44 are in proper condition for allowance and request that claims 41-44 may now be passed to allowance.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Applicants believe that the subject application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicants.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicant's attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc, with any fees which may be required in the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

February 7, 2007

Motorola, Inc.
8000 West Sunrise Boulevard
Law Department – MD1610
Plantation, Florida 33322
Customer Number: 24273

By: /Randi L. Karpinia/
Randi L. Karpinia
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 46,148
Tel: 954-723-6449
Fax: 954-723-3871
E-Mail: docketing.florida@motorola.com